

<b>Application No.</b> 09/473,495	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ATSUMI ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b> Justin R Fischer	<b>Art Unit</b> 1733	

**Status of Application:** *Pending*

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Time: 8:00**

☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Rejection(s) discussed:  
NA

Claims discussed:  
20-22

Prior art documents discussed:  
NA

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
See Continuation Sheet

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner suggested that applicant provide unexpected results to establish a criticality for forming a golf club shaft having the claimed weight and construction (regarding second angled layer), wherein the torsional strength is at least 120 kgf x m x degrees. In particular, it appears that the critical aspect of the claimed invention is the ability to obtain the aforementioned torsional strength while providing a lightweight golf club shaft- this is accomplished by modifying the thickness and the arrangement of the second angled layer. It was noted that the results of Table 2 do not provide a criticality for the claimed golf club shaft since they do not compare the claimed shaft with the closest prior art- the results of Table 2 show the individual benefits of having a second angled layer and having the fibers of the second angled layer disposed at an angle of 70 degrees. Lastly, it was pointed out to applicant that it was unclear if comparative example 1 of the original specification was a prior art shaft construction.